

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

AHMAD BISHAWI,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	CASE NO. 02-CV-958-MJR
)	
GRW CORPORATION, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

FRAZIER, Magistrate Judge:

Before the Court is plaintiff's motion to compel responses to written discovery (Doc. No. 70). The motion is opposed (Doc. No. 71). Plaintiff filed this motion pursuant to Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which provides that motions to compel "must include a certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the party not making the disclosure in an effort to secure the disclosure without court action." Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B). While plaintiff's motion contains no such certification, the materials submitted show that plaintiff tried to obtain some outstanding discovery by serving a "Final Request for Discovery." Because this effort arguably qualifies as a good faith attempt to resolve outstanding disputes, those portions of the motion are discussed below.

Rule 26(b) prescribes the scope of matters upon which a party may seek discovery. Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter not privileged that is relevant to the claim or defense of the parties. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 (b)(1). The requested information sought need not be admissible at the trial if the discovery appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. *Id.* Rule 34 provides that a party may request, among other things, the production of

documents that “constitute or contain matters within the scope of Rule 26(b)” and are in the custody or control of another party. Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a).

I. Requests for Production of Documents Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 9.

Plaintiff seeks personal files, logs, grievances and other documents, claiming that these materials are relevant to the issue of past mistreatment of inmates at Tri-County Detention Center by defendants. The pleadings have been reviewed, along with defendants’s objections and responses. The objections raised to Request Nos. 5, 6, and 7 are SUSTAINED and the documents provided in response to Request Nos. 7 and 9 are sufficient.

II. Interrogatory Nos. 5 and 7.

Plaintiff seeks information regarding inmate grievances and complaints and disciplinary actions against guards or officers. The objections are SUSTAINED and the responses provided are sufficient.

Plaintiff’s motion (Doc. No. 70) is DENIED.

SO ORDERED: January 20, 2006.

s/Philip M. Frazier
PHILIP M. FRAZIER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE